DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 433 HE 020 693

AUTHOR von Destinon, Mark A.
TITLE Student Fees: The Politics of Funding Recreation Facilities.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Decision Making; *Extracurricular Activities; *Fees; Higher Education; Models; *Political Influences; *Recreational Facilities; *Student Costs
IDENTIFIERS *University of Arizona

ABSTRACT

The political foundation of voluntary student financing of campus recreation facilities is examined. By combining Baldridge's Political Decision Making Model with Wildavsky's Clientele Strategy, the "Political Clientele Model" is proposed as a framework to analyze the process of constructing student funded recreational facilities. The process at the University of Arizona is used to illustrate the model. Guidelines for implementing similar projects at other institutions are drawn from the University of Arizona's experience. The political model takes into account that: people choose not to participate in making decisions, which are left to administrators or small groups of elites; there is fluid participation of people who experience varying interests and pressures; there are interest group pressures; conflict is unavoidable; negotiated compromises to conflict place limitations on formal authority; and external interest groups also exert pressure. Based on the political clientele mode, a successful financing campaign for recreational facility construction should involve: identifying and organizing clientele, expanding the clientele, serving the clientele, securing feedback, and working within the structure. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED286433

STUDENT FEES:
THE POLITICS OF FUNDING RECREATION FACILITIES

Mark A. von Destinon
The University of Arizona

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark A. von Destinon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 020 693

Abstract

This paper examines the political foundation of voluntary student financing of campus recreation facilities. By combining Baldridge's Political Decision Making Model with Wildavsky's Clientele Strategy the "Political Clientele Model" is proposed as a framework to analyze the process of constructing student funded recreational facilities. The process at one institution, the University of Arizona, is used to illustrate the model. Guidelines for implementing similar projects at other institutions are drawn from the University of Arizona's experience.

STUDENT FEES:

THE POLITICS OF FUNDING RECREATION FACILITIES

In the face of a national trend toward declining state funds for athletic and recreational facilities universities have found a new method of financing construction. Until recent years state appropriations and athletic event gate receipts were the two main funding sources for athletic and recreational facilities at state institutions. Economic and political factors have contributed to the decline of the state funds, while inflated operational costs have limited the availability of athletic receipts. Despite this scarcity of traditional sources of construction funds universities continue to finance recreation facilities. Through referenda students are assessing themselves increased fees to finance and retire the construction bonds. In return they are receiving a voice in the governance of the facilities they fund.

The action of students, already on limited budgets, voting to increase their fees for recreation, must be considered in the light of the societal trend toward recreation and physical fitness. Since the mid-1970's the nation has experienced an increasing demand for recreational activities and facilities (Monaghan, 1984; Preo, 1986;, Stewart, 1984). This ballooning of interest has led to increased competition for recreational space (Boyd and Phelps, 1985; Fink, 1985; Hammitt and Hammitt, 1985;

Miller, 1985) and has increased the attractiveness of those institutions who can provide it (Monaghan, 1984; Preo, 1986).

Theoretical Construct

The purpose of a theory is to provide a framework to explain behavior. In this instance the behavior, students voting to increase fees to finance construction of recreational facilities, is examined within the context of the Political Decision Making model of J. Victor Baldridge and the Clientele Strategy proposed by Aaron Wildavsky. The intent of this paper is to examine the political process of this phenomena and prescribe guidelines for implementation. In this study the theories are applied to the process at the University of Arizona in its recent drive to construct a recreation facility. Drawing from that experience, guidelines for implementing a student funded facility at other institutions are offered.

The Political Model developed by Baldridge provides an understanding of political situations within an academic structure and their impact upon policy formation. The foundation of the model lies in six assumptions about policy making within a political process; prevalent inactivity, fluid participation, interest group pressures, conflict, limitations on formal authority and external interest groups (Baldridge, 1971).

Strategies are the links between the intentions and perceptions of an interest group and the political system that

imposes restraints and creates opportunities for them. Wildavsky theorizes that cultivation of an active clientele is an essential aspect of the political process. The three major components of the clientele strategy are identification, service and expansion. These components are supported by two additional areas of action; feedback and concentration on individual constituencies (Wildavsky, 1964).

The history of the development of the student recreation center at the University of Arizona serves to illustrate the integration of the two theories. An understanding of the political processes and clientele involved at that institution provides guidelines for implementing similar projects at other institutions.

The method of the study results from a close personal involvement with the issue over the last two years. The author serves as a research assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs and has served as staff assistant to two of the committees that have grappled with this issue. The opportunity for involvement with the institutional decision processes and access to the historical materials facilitated the study.

Background

The concept of a recreational facility at the University of Arizona surfaced in the Fall of 1975 when student groups began to pressure for increased access to athletic facilities. The focal point of their activism was the recreational use of McKale Center, a comprehensive athletic facility managed by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. Finding the administration of the Athletic Department unresponsive to their wishes, the student groups formally organized in December as the Student Athletic Union (SAU), identifying their long-term goal as the the construction of a Student Recreation Center (Student Athletic Union, 1975).

In January of 1976, the Student Athletic Union undertook a poll of the student body in order to gather campus-wide support for a recreational facility. The focus of the poll was a fee increase to fund a construction bond. Though poll results indicated support for the new facility University administrators were unwilling to make a commitment. The Vice President for Student Relations expressed support for the concept on "its merits alone." He drew attention to the "political and economic realities" that: 1) the economic climate at that time was unfavorable to the sale of bonds; 2) opposition would come from those calling for the construction of additional classroom and office space; 3) funds had not yet been appropriated to furnish the new University Library (Zitz, 1976).

The Student Athletic Union then enlisted the aid of student government, the Associated Students of the University of Arizona (ASUA), who agreed to place a referendum on the ballot in the March election for student government officers. The referendum results confirmed the findings of the poll. Succumbing to student pressure the President of the University instructed the Vice President for Student Relations to appoint a committee to "look into the long range possibility of a major improvement in the intramural and recreation facilities on campus" (Edwards, 1976). This became the first of six committees appointed over a ten year period to study and make recommendations regarding a student recreation facility.

The first committee adopted the name of the University Recreational Sports Center Committee (URSC) and proceeded to collect additional data to justify the construction of a facility. The data collected over a two year period includes; facility use assessment, survey of facilities at other institutions, survey of the faculty and staff, construction estimates and an architectural rendering (URSC Committee, 1978).

At the same time, though following a different set of priorities, the Student Athletic Union and ASUA continued to pressure the administration over the Center. This culminated in August of 1976 when the students presented their final report reviewing activities at other institutions, addressing bonds for construction and outlining administrative organization and

operational details for the proposed facility (SAU and ASUA, 1976). In response the President instructed the URSC to include those topics in its final report (Schaefer, 1976).

In the spring semester of 1977, a preliminary report from the University Physical Resources Department indicated that the cost for the facility would be in excess of $8 million, rather than the $5 million originally proposed (Tregonis, 1977). Consequently, the student contribution, through a fee increase, would have to be greater. In March of 1977 a referendum was again held on the student government election ballot.

Although the results were consistent with previous responses on the issue, the administration saw a need for a stronger demonstration of support for the project. The Vice President for Student Relations stated that the results of the Spring referendum were not considered an adequate indication of student support for a financial commitment of that magnitude. He cited the defeat of a parking garage referendum the previous year, which had called for a $9 fee increase, as justification of the need for a stronger show of support for a student recreation facility (URSC Minutes, Nov. 30, 1977).

The responsibility for documenting additional support fell to the URSC, with the administration providing funding for a professional survey in April of 1978. The goal of the survey was to provide a 60% positive response for a $16 per semester fee

increase from 10% of the total student population. The survey received a poor response with only 43% of the students in favor of the increase. Failure to meet the administration's 60% requirement signaled the death of the issue and the URSC presented its final report in July (URSC, 1978).

The following year, 1979, the Faculty Senate charged the University Planning Committee with the task of "studying the feasibility of separating intramural sports and recreation from Athletics" (Faculty Senate Minutes, Feb. 5, 1979). Their efforts were aimed not solely at the separation of power, but at the provision of recreational facilities for general student use. This stance earned the Faculty Senate a rebuke from the President who stated that "the Senate should be cautious about moving into decision-making areas about University Administrative procedures and arrangements that lie outside of its purview" (Faculty Senate Minutes, May 7, 1979).

The action of the Faculty Senate was a reaction to the Athletic Department restricting the use of the major athletic facility, McKale Center, to intercollegiate athletic teams. Additionally, ASUA appealed to the President to establish a committee to review the 1978 proposal and to pursue it or recommend alternative recreational development packages (Proctor, 1985).

The formation of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Development of Recreational Facilities was the result of this pressure. In March of 1981, that committee produced a final report providing a foundation for the development of recreational facilities and services. Results of the work of this committee have been the partial remodeling of the basement of the 1920's era Bear Down Gym to provide weight-lifting facilities and the opening of the Park Student Fitness Center, a small facility operated by ASUA to provide weight lifting and aerobics. Funds for these projects were made available by the administration with an annual commitment of $100,000 from parking revenues toward student recreation (von Destinon, 1985).

These advances occurred slowly, yet served to appease student interests until October 1984 when ASUA again began to pressure for additional recreational access (Webb, 1984). In January of 1985, the University Facilities Committee charged the Vice President to form a study group on recreation (Woodard, 1985). This committee reviewed the data previously collected and the progress at other institutions. In that process they were able to provide the administration with sufficient justification for the Arizona Board of Regents to be presented with, and approve, a proposal to seek revenue bonding for a student recreation facility at their September meeting (Arizona Board of Regent, Sept. 1985).

Following the Regent's action, the President of the University formed the Student Recreation Center Committee and

charged it with planning the facility design, policies, procedures and programs (Koffler, 1985). The creation of this committee coincided with a professional survey and another student referendum. The question on the ballot was repeated verbatim on the survey, and results evidenced support for both the facility and the accompanying fee increase.

Two months later the President organized the Ad Hoc Committee on University Recreational Planning and charged it with responsibility to study and make recommendations regarding "programmatic, fiscal and organizational inter-relationships between and among intercollegiate athletics and all other forms of recreational activities on campus" (Koffler, 1985). Both Committees presented their final reports in May of 1986 and the following month the Arizona State Legislature approved bonding for the facility.

In the Fall the President authorized the Vice President for Student Affairs to appoint the Advisory Committee for the Recreation Center. The charge to that Committee is to advise the administration on all developmental aspects of the facility including funding, staffing, policies and procedures. Proceeding at the same time as the committee's deliberations are the fundraising, site selection, and architectural design for the facility.

Analysis

An analysis of the ten year debate over student recreation facilities at the University of Arizona is dependent upon an understanding of the diverse political pressures at work in the decision process for funding. The framework of this analysis assumes the identification of the clientele as the university community; ie., faculty, staff and students. The students represent not only the largest segment of the clientele, but also that most affected by the issue. The analysis follows the political model while integrating the clientele strategy.

The first assumption made by the political model is that inactivity prevails within the political process. For reasons as variant as the individuals themselves, people choose not to participate in decision making, even when opportunities are presented. Decisions are left to administrators or small groups of elites who reflect the interests and priorities of those making the choices.

The impact of this assumption upon student recreation decisions over the years at the University of Arizona is evident throughout the history of the issue. Table 1 shows one type of inactivity-- lack of participation. When given the opportunity to participate, only a minority of the student population has participated at anytime. The 1977 and 1978 referenda evidenced a lack of interest in and support for the issue by the primary

TABLE 1

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
STUDENT REFERENDA RESULTS
STUDENT FEE INCREASE TO FINANCE A RECREATION FACILITY

DATE	MARCH 10, 1976	MARCH 9, 1977	OCTOBER 29-30, 1985
ELIGIBLE STUDENT VOTERS	18,185	18,351	20,589
VOTES CAST	2,699 (15%)	3,433 (19%)	2,349 (11%)
YES VOTES	1,563 (53%)	1,806 (56%)	1,268 (54%)
AMOUNT OF INCREASE	$10/SEMESTER	$16/SEMESTER	$25/SEMESTER

clientele, the students. With the 1985 referenda, the consistency of the responses by the students over the years defeats that judgement. Organizers of the referenda strategy may not have been successful in expanding their clientele to generate large voter turnouts, but they were successful in the strategy of concentrating on individual constituencies and getting those students to the polls.

A second type of inactivity evident in the early years of the issue is the response time of the committees involved. Although each committee has shown action, the pace of that action has contributed to the delay of the process. The first committee took two years to produce a study of recreational facilities and make recommendations. By the time the report was ready much of the initial enthusiasm for the issue had passed. To secure feedback is a strategy that must contain an aspect of timeliness. Had the delay between the origination of the issue and the report been more timely the student clientele would have been able to pursue the issue based upon the original impetus. Due to the time elapsed between the formation of the committee and its final report the students had to rebuild their constituency base.

Fluid participation is the second assumption of the Political Model. It addresses the varying interests and pressures upon those individuals active in the process. Expedition of the process will take precedence over other concerns depending upon the responsibilities and interests of the participants. Under

this assumption one can attempt to explain the reason for a certain action within the structure of cost versus benefit, though cost data may be suspect and information on effectiveness totally lacking (Nienaber and Wildavsky, 1973).

The Student Athletic Union is one example of fluid participation in the recreation center development. Formed as a student interest group it represents a coalition of individual constituencies working to serve their clientele. Responsible for raising the issue of a student recreation facility, it ceased to be a force in the process and eventually ceased to exist altogether. Its interest was self-appointed, and due to other interests and responsibilities of its members, did not carry through to closure. The influence of the student government organization, ASUA, is another example of this assumption. The role that student government plays in the ten year process has varied with the interests of the participants.

The third of the assumptions is that of interest group pressures. They embody the entire concept of Wildavsky's Clientele Strategy. The issue of student recreation is a response to varying interest groups at different times. Initially, students organized and applied pressure in the manner they felt most likely to provide the desired response. The students organized in response to the use of athletic facilities by another interest group, intercollegiate athletics. The participation of that clientele in and upon the process has been constant

throughout all committee actions. Student Government, Physical Education Instruction and Intramurals represent other interest groups which impact the process. Each clientele perceives an interest which is construed as a entitlement to the right to make, or at least participate in, the decisions. The influence upon the development of the decision network by the different clientele is evidenced in the composition of the committees. Table 2 illustrates this by identifying each committee and its membership by position.

Conflict, the fourth assumption, is an unavoidable result of the processes addressed by the other assumptions. It is viewed as both a natural and significant factor in promoting healthy organizational change (Baldridge and Riley, 1977). The Clientele Strategy presupposes conflict and advocates management of clientele to present the perception of power. Conflict and power play important roles in the funding process. Actions taken are frequently the direct result of perceptions and the desire to avoid complications.

In the development of the student recreation center, the weave of conflict and power can be seen in many areas. The origination of the issue was the result of conflict and is also the reason that it has never been abandoned. Two of the three concerns, those regarding additional classroom space and library funds, cited by the Vice President of Student Relations in January of 1976, represent conflicts (Zitz, 1976). The advances under the

TABLE 2

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

TEN YEAR COMPARISON OF COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS FOR STUDENT RECREATIONAL FACILITIES (1976-1986)

UNIVERSITY RECREATIONAL SPORTS CENTER COMMITTEE 1976-1978	ASUA AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE 1979-1981	FACILITIES COMMITTEE STUDY GROUP JAN. TO SEPT. 1985	PRESIDENT'S STUDENT RECREATION CENTER COMMITTEE 1985-1986	AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY RECREATIONAL PLANNING 1985-1986	STUDENT RECREATION CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE 1986
Chair- Assistant Vice President for Student Relations	Chair- Athletic Director	Chair- Vice President for Student Affairs	Chair- Vice President for Student Affairs	Chair- Director, Student Health Center	Chair- Director, Student Health Center
Faculty- Associate Professor, Physical Education	Admin.- Assistant Vice President for Student Relations	Faculty- Director of Administration and Athletics	Admin.- Vice President for University Relations	Admin.- Comptroller	Admin.- Dean of Students
Faculty- Associate Director, Men's Athletics	Staff- Manager, Physical Resources	Staff- Property Planner	Admin.- Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Affairs	Admin.- Dean of Students	Admin.- Director of Administration and Athletics
Staff- Director of Intramural Programs	3 Students- ASUA President and 2 Senators	Staff- Native American Advisor	Admin.- Director of Intercollegiate Athletics	Admin.- Director of Alumni Association	Staff- Member, President's Staff Advisory Council
Staff- Associate Director, Physical Resources		Student- ASUA President	Admin.- Associate Vice President for Administration	Admin.- Director of Intercollegiate Athletics	Faculty- Professor, Exercise and Sports Sciences
Staff- Coordinator, Physical Education			Admin.- Dean of Students	Faculty- Dean, College of Pharmacy	Faculty- President, Faculty Senate
2 Students- Members of the Student Athletic Union			Faculty- Professor, Exercise and Sports Sciences	Faculty- Associate Professor, Exercise and Sports Sciences	4 Students- ASUA President, Arizona Student's Assoc., Graduate Student, Disabled Student
			Faculty- President, Faculty Senate	3 Students- ASUA Senator, Club Sports, Residence Hall Assoc.	
			Staff- Member, President's Staff Advisory Council		
			5 Students- Graduate Student, ASUA President, Disabled Student, Off Campus Student, Arizona Student's Assoc.		

second committee are resultant of conflict compromises and are the first representations of alternative solutions found in the study (Proctor, 1985). Review of the composition of the committees in Table 2 show an attempt at conflict management in the design. Each sub-section of the clientele within the University is represented. The work of these committee represents the underlying principle of conflict compromise.

Negotiated compromises to conflict place limitations on formal authority, the fifth assumption of the political model. Specific limitation on authority with regard to student recreation were first evidenced by the Vice President for Student Relations by his mention of areas of concern (Zitz, 1976). The comments directed at the Faculty Senate in 1979 by the President recognize limitations as does the commitment of funds by the administration in 1981 (Faculty Senate Minutes, May 7, 1979; St. John and Duffy, 1981). Each refer to an interest or condition restricting action on the question.

The political process is most evident in the fifth assumption. Construction could not begin without a major commitment of funds. The clientele of the recreation center must compete for funds against the interests of all the other clientele on campus. To remove themselves from that competition, the students chose to finance their own facility. In the original plan the students would have paid the entire cost for the facility. Ten years later, the cost of the facility is estimated at three times what

it would have been in 1977, and the students have agreed to pay only 2/3 of the cost. To meet this obligation, students voted to increase fees to retire a bond debt. Permission to issue the bonds requires authorization from the Board of Regents and from the Arizona State Legislature. Every step of the procedure is subject to political whim.

Herein lies the sixth assumption, the role of external interest groups. Assuming that the internal conflicts have been resolved in the development process the clientele must now concern themselves with outside pressures. These external interests may surface at any time within the process. Pressures from these external groups, or even the implied threat thereof, are powerful determinants of internal processes.

The political model and the clientele strategy interface to such a great extent that it is difficult to separate them easily. At times, as is often the case in a political construct, more than one of the factors will be viewed as important to the analysis of a specified action. It is felt that the highlights reviewed are sufficient to provide understanding of both the complexity of the analysis and the political nature of the funding process.

Application

The study and analysis of "the political clientele model" at the University of Arizona identifies strategies that can be used at other institutions as guidelines for implementing recreational facility construction. Those who pursue the use of student funds for construction should be aware of the political realities of the issue and prepare a strategy to insure its success. The following five guidelines are drawn from the experience of the University of Arizona with "the political clientele model." They provide a foundation upon which to build a successful financing campaign, but do not insure success or anticipate the political climate at each institution.

1. Identify and Organize the Clientele

The major clientele has already been established. If students are expected to fund all or a large part of the construction costs then the proper place to begin is by enlisting their interest and support. Considering the national trends previously identified, students may already have been discouraged in this issue. Participation by, and support of the students is the major ingredient for success. It is best if the issue is student generated, but even if it is not, students may be willing to fund their own facility in return for a voice in its governance. The major vehicle to work through will be student government, but don't stop there; target other student groups who have a stake in the outcome of the issue and get them involved.

2. Expand the Clientele

Students, as the funding source, will be the primary Clientele, but there are other groups on campus that will have an interest in the issue. The Faculty, Staff, and Alumni organizations are areas that need to be considered in your plan. Athletics, Intramurals, and Instruction will have an interest in the issue and their cooperation must be secured. Conflicts will arise, but by including each clientele in the decision process will ameliorate dissent.

3. Serve the Clientele

Service is the purpose of a recreation facility and it is a purpose that should not wait until the doors of the building open for business. Once the issue rises students can be served by keeping them informed and involved in the development of the project. Remember that it is a student facility, paid for by their funds, and they should be involved in the development. Serve the students by presenting a positive attitude toward the facility and not permitting the issue to wane.

4. Secure Feedback

This is a strategy that will help to keep a high level of interest in the issue and will allow all groups the opportunity to have input into the process. This involves data collection in the form of surveys, use assessments, etc. Not only will important information be collected in this period, but the campus community will feel a sense of participation in the development.

5. Work Within the Structure

This involves a knowledge of the history, tradition and procedures of the campus. Assess the available programs, who controls the budgets and what funds are accessible. It is important to know if there are any programs that were cancelled for a lack of space, funds, or support. Attempt to identify other funds or sources of income that can be used to support recreation. These can be either minor funds for expenses related to promotion of the issue and office supplies, or they can be major commitments, as in the parking revenues at the University of Arizona. This area also involves the admonition not to make the student government and the administration adversaries. Confrontation is not productive. Cooperation should be emphasized and it is an opportunity for the students to work with, and learn from, the administration.

Adherence to these guidelines provides a starting point in the facility development process. As the University of Arizona model illustrates, it is not an easy task, nor is it one that can be accomplished without major effort. However, the long-term benefits of having a recreational facility available to the campus community outweigh the short-term difficulties which may be presented in the development process.

Summary

This paper has examined the political foundation of financing recreational facilities through the use of student fees. It

suggests "the Political Clientele Model" for support of financing student recreational facilities by combining the Political Decision Making Model of J. Victor Baldridge with the the Clientele Strategy of Aaron Wildavsky.

The Political Clientele Model provides a framework for the analysis of the recreation funding process by focusing on the political motivations of the interest groups. The student body is presented as the primary clientele and other interest groups impacting recreational finance decisions are identified. Additionally, the paper prescribes strategic guidelines on which to build a successful campaign. One institution, the University of Arizona, was used to illustrate both the model and the guidelines.

The importance of this method of financing student facilities cannot be underestimated. With declining state appropriations and the new tax structure it is necessary for universities to become more creative in construction finance strategies. Providing students with a responsible role in the finance and decision-making process recognizes the importance of the contribution students can make to their institutions. They are not just the recipients of education, they are active participants in the educational process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arizona State Board of Regents. Arizona State Board of Regents Minutes. Phoenix: Board of Regents, Finance Item #4, September 6-7, 1985.

Baldridge, J. Victor, Ed. Academic Governance. Berkeley: McCutchen, 1977.

Baldridge, J.V., Curtis, D., Ecker, G. and Riley, G. Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Baldridge, J.V. and Riley, G. Governing Academic Organizations. Berkeley: McCutchen, 1977.

Boyd, D. and Phelps, D. "Expanding Accessible Recreational Facilities to the Campus and Beyond." National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association Journal. Fall 1985, pp. 18-22.

Bronzan, R. "Student Fees: A New Source for Funding Facilities." Athletic Business. March 1984, pp. 18-22.

Edwards R. M. Committee on Student Activities Memo. University of Arizona: Student Relations, April 26, 1976.

Fink, I. and Body, D. "Developing a Sports and Recreational Master Plan." National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association Journal. Fall 1985, pp. 25-36.

Hammitt, S. and Hammitt, W. "Campus Recreational Facilities: Planning for Better Use." Journal of Physical Education and Recreation Development. January 1985, pp. 23-26.

Koffler, H. Letter to Dr. Murray DeArmond. University of Arizona: President, December 26, 1985.

Miller, G. "Recommended Standards Regarding Space Use for Athletics, Physical Education, and Recreation in the United States." National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association Journal. Fall, 1985, pp. 37-41.

Monaghan, P. "Athletics for the Fun of it: Big Boom on Campuses." The Chronicle of Higher Education. October 17, 1985, pp. 26-29.

Nienaber, J. and Wildavksy, A. The Budgeting and Evaluation of Federal Recreation Programs. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Polsby, N. and Wildavsky, A. Presidential Elections: Strategies of American Electoral Politics. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1980.

Preo, L. "College Rec's Future is Now." Athletic Business. January, 1986, pp. 12-17.

Proctor, M. Facility Committee Study Group Memo. University of Arizona: Student Affairs, January 30, 1985.

Schaefer, J.P. Letter to Messrs. Mitchell, Webb, and Fisher. University of Arizona: President, October 7, 1976.

St. John, R. and Duffy, T. Report of the University Ad Hoc Committee on the Development of Recreational Facilities. University of Arizona: Associated Students of the University of Arizona, March 4, 1981.

Stewart, R. "Intramural-Recreational Sports Trends." National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association Journal. Fall 1984, pp. 15-17.

Student Athletic Union. Student Athletic Union Goals 1975. University of Arizona: Dean of Students, December 30, 1975.

Student Athletic Union and the Associated Students of the University of Arizona. Recreational Sports Center Student Recommendations. University of Arizona, August 13, 1976.

Tregonis, V. University Recreational Sports Center Memo. University of Arizona: Physical Resources, March 4, 1977.

University of Arizona Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes. University of Arizona, February 5, 1979.

University of Arizona Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes. University of Arizona, May 7, 1979.

University Planning Committee. Subcommittee Report in the Separation of Intramurals and Intercollegiate Athletics. University of Arizona: Administrative Services, Feb. 26, 1980.

University Recreational Sports Center Committee. University Recreational Sports Center Committee Meeting Minutes. University of Arizona, November 30, 1977.

University Recreational Sports Center Committee. Final Report: Proposal for University Recreational Sports Center. University of Arizona, July 1978.

von Destinon, M. Interview with Dr. Frank Felix, Director, Student Affairs. University of Arizona, March 5, 1986.

Webb, T. "ASUA Seeks Prompt Action on Recreation Issue," Arizona Daily Wildcat. October 21, 1984.

Wildavsky, A. The Politics of the Budgetary Process. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 3rd Edition, 1979.

Wildavsky, A. The Revolt Against the Masses. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Zitz, M. "Poll Today to Gauge Interest in Proposed Facility." Arizona Daily Wildcat. January 21, 1976.